<div align="center">

Remarks

</div>

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2008.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Objections and/or Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed on January 28, 2008, Claims 1-4 and 6-20 were pending. In the Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12-15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al (US 7,181,757) (hereinafter "Kim") and further in view of Bhagavath et al (US 6,829,781 B1) (hereinafter "Bhagavath"). Claims 3, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Bhagavath, and further in view of Jun (US 6,931,594 B1) (hereinafter "Jun"). Claims 17 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Bhagavath, and further in view of Li et al (US 7,035,435 B2) (hereinafter "Li").

II.   Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1, 3, 10-13 and 15-20; cancels Claim 8; and adds Claims 21-24. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented claims or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, it was stated that there is no support for "full motion video" in the specification by the Examiner. The words "full motion video" has been replaced by the words "multimedia stream" in the claims as shown above. Support for "multimedia stream" can be found in paragraphs [0042] – [0046] in the application as published, among other places in the application, as the application includes several references to "views of multimedia content" and "media streams." Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

<div align="center">

- 7 -

</div>

IV.   **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101.**

In the Office Action, Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 20 has been amended as shown above to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

V.   **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12-15, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kim</u> and further in view of <u>Bhagavath</u>. Claims 3, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kim</u> and <u>Bhagavath</u>, and further in view of <u>Jun</u>. Claims 17 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Kim</u> and <u>Bhagavath</u>, and further in view of <u>Li</u>.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Reply to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1.   (Currently Amended)   A method for automatically generating a multi-level video summary, comprising:
automatically dividing a video file into multimedia stream segments without user input using segmenting criteria;
automatically generating at least two summary levels without user input, wherein each of the summary levels has a different level of detail and each of the summary levels is a linear multimedia stream which includes at least one of the multimedia stream segments from the video file, the multimedia stream segments in each of the summary levels selected using selection criteria and at least one algorithm; and
automatically generating navigational links between the multimedia stream segments in the summary levels without user input, wherein one or more algorithms are used to dynamically determine link behavior, the navigational links connecting the multimedia stream segments containing related material.

<u>Kim</u> appears to disclose an approach to select important video sequences for a summary. Importance may be determined by detected events such as goals in a soccer game. Subsets of the important video sequences are then selected for summaries of different lengths. Each video sequence in a summary appears to be represented by a keyframe. From a keyframe related to a summary level, the original video scene containing that keyframe may be

- 8 -

selected. It does not appears possible to go from video in one summary level to video in another summary level in <u>Kim</u>. In other words, access to video is only possible by keyframes.

      <u>Bhagavath</u> discloses a network-based service to provide on-demand video summaries of television programs. More specifically, it describes a system for navigating between a single level video summary and the source video. <u>Bhagavath</u> appears to assume the existence of metadata within the source video and the summaries, namely that the broadcasters will provide both the content of the source video and the summary with indexes and tags that already include encoded links.

      Applicants' invention embodied in Claim 1 is not anticipated by or obvious in light of <u>Kim</u> or <u>Bhagavath</u>, among other things, for the following reasons. Neither <u>Kim</u> nor <u>Bhagavath</u> disclose using algorithms for generating summaries or dynamically determining link behavior. For example, the links used in <u>Kim</u> appear to simply link to the start of scenes in the original video and the links used in <u>Bhagavath</u> appear to link to index markers that were previously inserted via an unspecified method. Accordingly, Applicants' invention embodied in Claim 1 is not anticipated by or obvious in light of <u>Kim</u> or <u>Bhagavath</u>.

      Additionally, it is noted that Former Claim 8 (which has now been cancelled and incorporated into Claim 1) included the following limitation: "providing at least one algorithm to be used in generating a multi-level video summary." In the Office Action, Column 4, lines 15-18 of <u>Kim</u> was cited when rejecting former Claim 8. However, Column 4, lines 15-18 of <u>Kim</u> cannot reasonably be read to disclose any algorithm which can be used to generate a multi-level video summary. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of former Claim 8 was unsupported and improper.

      In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

      Applicants' invention embodied in Claim 10 provides for the ability for an author to refine the navigational links within the automatically generated multi-level video summaries. Neither <u>Kim</u> nor <u>Bhagavath</u> allow an author to refine the navigational links between multi-level video summaries. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not anticipated by or obvious in light of <u>Kim</u> or <u>Bhagavath</u>.

Claim 13

Applicants' invention embodied in Claim 13 indicates that the placement of the source anchor and the destination anchor within each summary level is dynamically determined using an algorithm. Neither Kim nor Bhagavath dynamically determine the placement of source anchors and destination anchors based on an algorithm. Accordingly, Claim 13 is not anticipated by or obvious in light of Kim or Bhagavath.

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-18

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-18 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that those claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the amendments to Claim 1, and the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that those claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that those claims also add their own limitations which renders them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 19 and 20

Independent Claims 19 and 20 have been amended similar to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein and the comments provided for Claim 1 above are incorporated by reference herein. In view of the comments provided above for Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments defined by Claims 19 and 20 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 25, 2008

By: ___/Rex Hwang/_____
       Rex Hwang
       Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800